

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the final Office Action of December 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kimura et al.* (“*Kimura*”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,518,962) in view of *Brody* (U.S. Patent No. 4,982,273). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

Referring to Applicants’ Figure 7 as an illustrative example, claims 1 and 6, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to an organic electroluminescence display having a substrate and a device layer provided on the substrate. The device layer includes a plurality of luminescent devices that each have an emitting area (each emitting area designated by dashed lines in Figure 7). A contact 39 electrically connects each luminescent device to a corresponding pixel circuit. The contact 39 is provided between adjacent emitting areas of the luminescent devices.

This is clearly unlike *Kimura* in view of *Brody*, which fails to disclose or suggest a contact that is provided between adjacent emitting areas of luminescent devices. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Kimura* fails to teach Applicants’ claimed contacts that are located outside of light emitting areas of luminescent devices. *Office Action of 12/15/06*, pages 2-3.

Brody also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed contacts. As clearly shown in *Brody* Figure 4b, *Brody*’s contacts 27 are located entirely beneath *Brody*’s emitting areas 19 (corresponding to picture elements 18). Nowhere does *Brody* disclose or suggest that its contacts 27 are provided between adjacent emitting areas 19. Thus, *Kimura* in view of *Brody* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed contacts.

In the Advisory Action of April 3, 2007, the Examiner alleges that “applicant has said in the response the contacts are shown to be at the edges of the emitting area and are not under the emitting area.” *Advisory Action of 4/3/07*, page 2. Applicants made no such statement. In the Amendment After Final that was filed on March 5, 2007, Applicants pointed out that “although [Brody’s] contacts 27 are shown as being at the edges of the emitting areas 19, they are still taught and shown to be provided under these emitting areas 19.” This means that in Brody’s Figure 4c, the contacts 27 are shown at the edge of the light emitting areas, because it is a cross-sectional view. As clearly shown in the top view of Figure 4b, the contacts 27 are not positioned at the edges of the emitting areas 19. It appears that the Examiner has failed to recognize that Figure 4c is a cross-sectional view, and has misinterpreted our statement. We disagree with the

Examiner.

For at least these reasons, *Kimura* in view of *Brody* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 6.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 6 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1 – 7 are clearly patentable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No.: 45,034
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

14536238